

REMARKS

Initially, Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for his courtesy in conducting a telephonic interview with Applicants' representative on January 24, 2006. Further to the interview, Applicants have amended the claims as set forth herein, to include location management based on ATM network signaling.

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 8-11, 17 and 19-24 will have been canceled, without prejudice and without disclaimer of the subject matter, and claim 25 will have been amended to recite that a signaling protocol message includes a plurality of fields, at least one of which is modified to include an address of the remote access port. Claim 26 will have been amended for minor clarification. Also, claims 34-49 will have been added for the Examiner's consideration. Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are now in condition for allowance.

In the above-referenced Official Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4-14, 16-26 and 28-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over GALLANT et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0026553) in view of ZHOU et al., *Efficient Location Management for Hybrid Wireless ATM Networks Architecture and Performance Analysis* (IEEE 1999). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, at least for the reasons stated below.

No proper combination of GALLANT et al. and ZHOU et al. teach or suggest location management implemented based on ATM network signaling. As previously argued by Applicants in their Reply under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111, filed July 22, 2005, and their Response under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116, filed December 18,


2005 (on all of which Applicants continue to rely), the Examiner admitted that GALLANT et al. do not teach enabling a high-speed network subscriber to request a Switched Virtual Circuit (SVC) connection from an access port that is different from the subscriber's permanent or initial access port. The Examiner therefore relied on ZHOU et al., in combination with GALLANT et al., to teach this feature. However, the ZHOU et al. article is directed to a hybrid wireless/ATM network, in which location management is performed by the wireless network – not the ATM network – apparently relying on the Mobile IP standard. Accordingly, the combination of GALLANT et al. and ZHOU et al., does not teach or suggest location management based on ATM network signaling, and thus withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the herein contained amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the previously asserted rejections set forth in the Official Action of October 18, 2005, together with an indication of the allowability of all pending claims, in due course. Such action is respectfully requested and is believed to be appropriate and proper.

Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this amendment, and which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attached thereto.

Should the Examiner have any questions concerning this Reply or the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully Submitted,
Philip CUNETTO et al.



Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027

William Pieprz
Reg. No. 33,630

February 10, 2006
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191